

One loop fermion contribution to the effective potential for constant SU(2) Yang-Mills fields

NISTOR NICOLAEVICI

*Technical University of Timișoara, Department of Physics,
P-ța Horațiu 1, RO-1900 Timișoara, Romania*

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We obtain a series expansion for the one loop fermion contribution to the effective potential for constant A_μ^a fields in the SU(2) theory with a massive fermionic doublet. The series converges for bounded electric fields in terms of the magnetic fields and the gauge potentials. One finds that spontaneous fermion pair creation may be absent for arbitrary strong pure electric fields, with an appropriate choice of the classical currents.

PACS: 11.15.Tk

Fifty years ago, in a famous Q.E.D. calculation [1] J. Schwinger obtained the $\hbar$ contribution to the electromagnetic effective Lagrangian for constant (classical) fields. It seems there are no similar results for fermionic contributions in non-abelian theories. Our intention here is to briefly present a calculation for the analogous quantity in the SU(2) theory with a $j = \frac{1}{2}$ massive fermionic multiplet. We restrict to this representation for mainly technical reasons: for this representation calculations significantly simplify due to the properties of Pauli matrices (see the next footnote). We mention from start, that unlike in Ref. [1], our result is not of maximum generality by failing to apply to certain field configurations, as it will become apparent from our computational procedure.

Two aspects specific to non-abelianity are of direct relevance in what follows. First, constant gauge potentials do not necessarily imply the vanishing of the field strengths. We shall do the calculations precisely for this case, *i.e.* (all notations are conventional)

$$A_\mu^a(x) = \text{const}, \quad (1)$$

so that we shall actually obtain the $\hbar$ effective potential. Second, constant field strengths do not entail the vanishing of the corresponding classical currents. (In fact, under conditions (1) a null current necessarily means a pure gauge.) Also in contrast to the abelian case, the classical equations determine the currents in terms of the field strengths *and* the potentials (via the covariant derivatives). Physically, this is expected to manifest in the explicit dependence of the quantum contribution on both of these quantities, as we shall indeed find out.

We begin by writing the basic Lagrangian as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu} + i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(\partial_\mu - iA_\mu^a \frac{\sigma_a}{2})\psi - m\bar{\psi}\psi, \quad (2)$$

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + \varepsilon_{abc}A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \quad a, b, c = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3)$$

We included for simplicity the coupling constant into the definitions of A_μ^a , $F_{\mu\nu}^a$. As a first step, we need the one loop effective action for the classical A_μ^a field. This is most directly obtained in the path integral formalism by integrating out the ψ field

$$S_{eff} = -i \ln \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp iS[A_\mu^a, \bar{\psi}, \psi], \quad (4)$$

(S is the classical action). It is clear that ghost terms are unnecessary here. The integral is a Gaussian in Grassmannian variables, which can be evaluated by standard methods [2]. One finds for the $\hbar$ fermionic contribution

$$S_{eff}^{1,f} = -i \ln \text{Det} ((\gamma^\mu (P_\mu - A_\mu^a \frac{\sigma_a}{2}) - m), \quad (5)$$

where Det is the determinant in the functional sense and P_μ are the translation operators in coordinates space. m tacitly incorporates the $i\epsilon$ prescription. Our subsequent efforts will be to extract information from eq. (5).

Using the charge conjugation matrix $C\gamma_\mu C^{-1} = -\gamma_\mu^T$ and the properties of the determinant, one can eliminate the gamma matrices (see Ref. [3]) to obtain

$$S_{eff}^{1,f} = -\frac{i}{2} \ln \text{Det} ((P_\mu - A_\mu^a \frac{\sigma_a}{2})^2 - m^2). \quad (6)$$

We use next the $\ln \text{Det} = \text{Tr} \ln$ formula and the Schwinger representation for the logarithm. When tracing over space-time coordinates, translational invariance allows separation of the four-volume factor $\int d^4x$. The trace over spinorial indices yields simply a 4 factor. Tracing over the group indices amounts to evaluate, after expanding the square in eq. (6), the trace of a $\text{SU}(2)$ matrix¹ in exponential parameterization. One finally arrives to the following expression for the effective potential ($A^2 = A_\mu^a A^{a\mu}$):

$$V_{eff}^{1,f} = -4i \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} \exp is(-m^2 + A^2/4) \\ \times \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \cos s \sqrt{(p^\mu A_\mu^a)(p^\nu A_\nu^a)} \exp isp^2 - \text{ST}. \quad (7)$$

ST stands for a subtraction term corresponding to the expression evaluated at null potentials. Consider a four vector K_μ with $K^\mu K_\mu = A^2$. One can easily verify that ST can be obtained by replacing the $\cos$ factor in the second integral with

$$\cos s(p^\mu K_\mu) \quad (8)$$

¹For $j > 1/2$ representations, anticommutations of the group generators will generally lead to $\text{SU}(2j+1)$ elements. The quantity under square root in eq. (7) becomes then a generalized quadratic form in p_μ , making the d^4p integral more difficult.

and leaving A^2 unchanged. We shall consider this quantity to perform the subtraction, instead of that resulting by simply setting $A_\mu^a = 0$. This trick will make apparent at the end of the calculations that, as expected, the potential vanishes for $F_{\mu\nu}^a = 0$.

We rotate next the p_μ integration contours as (latin indices i, j, k run over 1, 2, 3)

$$p^0 \rightarrow e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} p^0, \quad p^i \rightarrow e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}} p^i, \quad (9)$$

making the exp factor in eq. (7) a Gaussian in p_0, p_i , and shift to four-dimensional spherical coordinates. At this point, unfortunately, a further closed evaluation becomes rather impossible: with a series of integration by parts the radial integration can be written $\int_0^\infty dz \sin az \exp -sz^2$ (a contains the angular and A_μ^a dependence) letting itself expressed [4] in terms of $\text{Erfi}(a/2\sqrt{s})$, which makes the angular integration untractable. We shall continue by expanding the cosines in Taylor series, with the obvious mention that by doing so we lost maximum generality. The validity of the result will be discussed a little further.

After performing the radial integration, each term yields a finite result for $s > 0$ fixed. To account for the angular integration, it is convenient to define the matrices

$$\omega_{\mu\nu}^A = \tilde{A}_\mu^a \tilde{A}_\nu^a, \quad \omega_{\mu\nu}^K = \tilde{K}_\mu \tilde{K}_\nu, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\tilde{A}_0^a = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} A_0^a, \quad \tilde{A}_i^a = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}} A_i^a, \quad \text{similarly for } \tilde{K}_\mu, \quad (11)$$

along with the quantities

$$V_n = i^n \frac{n+1}{2\pi} \left\{ \int d\Omega_n (\omega_{\mu\nu}^A n_\mu n_\nu)^n - \int d\Omega_n (\omega_{\mu\nu}^K n_\mu n_\nu)^n \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Notations in eq. (12) are as follows: n_μ is the unit four-vector $n_\mu n_\mu = 1$, the lowered indices indicating summation with respect to the Euclidean metric. The integrations extends over the Euclidean 3-sphere, with $d\Omega_n$ the infinitesimal angle around n_μ .

The behavior with respect to s integration for $s \rightarrow 0$ formally splits $V_{eff}^{1,f}$ into an infinite and a finite part. The infinite part reads

$$V_{inf}^{1,f} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{n=0}^2 i^n \frac{n!}{(2n)!} V_n \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s^{3-n}} \exp is(-m^2 + A^2/4). \quad (13)$$

The first two terms, however, vanish due to the angular integrations (cf. eq. (20) below)

$$V_0 = V_1 = 0. \quad (14)$$

For $n = 2$, the s integral diverges logarithmically, but this is also no trouble since

$$V_2 = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu}. \quad (15)$$

The divergence is proportional to the pure Yang-Mills Lagrangian, which amounts to a wave function and coupling constant renormalization. Discarding an infinite contribution and imposing the quantum contribution to vanish for $A_\mu^a \rightarrow 0$, one obtains the renormalized quantity

$$V_{ren}^{1,f} = \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \ln \left(1 - \frac{A^2}{4m^2} \right) F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu}. \quad (16)$$

For $n \geq 3$, terms are individually finite and give

$$V_{fin}^{1,f} = \frac{m^4}{4\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{A^2}{4m^2} \right)^2 \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} \frac{(n-3)! n!}{(2n)!} \hat{V}_n, \quad (17)$$

where we introduced the adimensional quantities

$$\hat{V}_n = \frac{V_n}{(m^2 - A^2/4)^n}. \quad (18)$$

$\hat{V}_n$ for n arbitrary can be obtained by evaluating the Gaussians

$$\int d^4x \exp[x_\mu x_\nu (i\sigma \hat{\omega}_{\mu\nu}^{A,K} - \delta_{\mu\nu})], \quad \hat{\omega}_{\mu\nu}^{A,K} = \frac{\omega_{\mu\nu}^{A,K}}{m^2 - A^2/4}, \quad (19)$$

and taking the n th σ derivative at $\sigma = 0$. The result is

$$\hat{V}_n = \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \right)^n \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + Z_1 \sigma + Z_2 \sigma^2 + Z_3 \sigma^3}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + Z_1 \sigma}} \right) \Big|_{\sigma=0}, \quad (20)$$

where Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are the (globally) gauge invariant quantities

$$Z_1 = \frac{A^2}{m^2 - A^2/4}, \quad (21)$$

$$Z_2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu}}{(m^2 - A^2/4)^2}, \quad (22)$$

$$Z_3 = \frac{1}{6} \frac{\varepsilon_{abc} F_{\mu}^{a\nu} F_{\nu}^{b\lambda} F_{\lambda}^{c\mu}}{(m^2 - A^2/4)^3}. \quad (23)$$

The polynomials under the radicals are, in order, the determinants of the matrices in the exponent in eq. (19) corresponding to A, K superscripts respectively. This concludes our calculation. Note that the indeterminacy introduced by K_μ disappeared.

It is transparent from eqs. (20)-(23) that for vanishing field strengths all $\hat{V}_n$ are zero, which makes $V_{eff}^{1,f} = 0$. One sees also that, as already pointed out, an explicit dependence on the potentials survives through A^2 .

We come now to the question of the convergence of series (17). Numerical factors for $n \rightarrow \infty$ imply it behaves as

$$\sum_n^\infty 4^{-n} \hat{V}_n. \quad (24)$$

We shall demand, for safety, convergence of each sum defined by the two square roots in eq. (20). For the second one, one readily recognizes the Z_1 power expansion of $\sqrt{1 + Z_1/4}$, so we have to set

$$|Z_1| < 4, \quad (25)$$

or

$$-\infty < A^2 < 2m^2. \quad (26)$$

For the first sum, we proceed as follows. One sees that $\lambda_0 = 0$ is always an eigenvalue² of $\hat{\omega}_{\mu\nu}^A$, and let us denote $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ the remaining ones. This

²There always exists a non-zero vector $\tilde{X}_\mu$ such that $\tilde{A}_\mu^a \tilde{X}_\mu = 0$ for all a , hence $\hat{\omega}_{\mu\nu}^A \tilde{X}_\nu = 0$.

makes $-i\lambda_{1,2,3}^{-1}$ the roots of the cubic polynomial in eq. (20). Then the sum in eq. (24) can be organized as

$$\sum_{n_1, n_2, n_3}^{\infty} \prod_{r=1}^3 \frac{1}{4^{n_r} n_r!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \right)^{n_r} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - i\lambda_r \sigma}} \Big|_{\sigma=0}, \quad (27)$$

and convergence similarly requests

$$|\lambda_r| < 4, \quad r = 1, 2, 3. \quad (28)$$

Let us introduce electric and magnetic fields

$$E_i^a = F_{0i}^a, \quad B_i^a = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ijk} F_{jk}^a. \quad (29)$$

A closer inspection of inequalities (28) reveals that for A^2 and $\mathbf{B}^a$ fixed, they define a *bounded* set in the $\mathbf{E}^a$ space. Analysis in general case proves fairly involved, as solutions of a cubic equation have to be considered explicitly. We shall restrict to the special situation³ $Z_3 = 0$, or

$$\mathbf{E}^1 \cdot (\mathbf{B}^2 \times \mathbf{B}^3) + \mathbf{E}^2 \cdot (\mathbf{B}^3 \times \mathbf{B}^1) + \mathbf{E}^3 \cdot (\mathbf{B}^1 \times \mathbf{B}^2) - \mathbf{B}^1 \cdot (\mathbf{B}^2 \times \mathbf{B}^3) = 0, \quad (30)$$

for which things become particularly simple. One finds that conditions (28) reduce, for all r , to the single inequality

$$E^2 < B^2 + 16m^4 \left(1 - \frac{A^2}{4m^2} \right) \left(1 - \theta(A^2) \frac{A^2}{2m^2} \right), \quad (31)$$

where

$$E^2 = \mathbf{E}^a \cdot \mathbf{E}^a, \quad B^2 = \mathbf{B}^a \cdot \mathbf{B}^a, \quad (32)$$

and θ is the Heaviside step function. We mention that in arriving to eq. (31) we used, in addition, the inequality

$$E^2 \geq B^2 - (A^2)^2/3, \quad (33)$$

which results as a direct consequence of definitions of $\mathbf{E}^a$, $\mathbf{B}^a$ in terms of A_μ^a .

³An immediate example are the pure electric fields $\mathbf{B}^a = 0$.

Relation (31) deserves a comment: it implies that for B^2 fixed and $A^2 < 0$ variable, there is generally *no* definite upper bound for E^2 . With a proper choice of the gauge potentials (or of the classical currents), one can set it arbitrarily high. One can easily check, for example, that for pure electric fields A^2 can be taken arbitrarily large and negative, while keeping $\mathbf{E}^a$ constants.

It is interesting to note that convergence is always assured for pure magnetic fields $\mathbf{E}^a = 0$, no special conditions assumed. One can always consider in this case $A_0^a = 0$, automatically satisfying eq. (26). (Non-zero temporal components demand $\mathbf{B}^a = 0$ too. One can directly show then the second integral in eq. (7) is independent of A_μ^a .) One further notes that $i\lambda_{1,2,3}$ are real and positive, as the matrix $i\hat{\omega}_{jk}^A$ is real, symmetric and positive definite. From the positivity of trace one has

$$0 < \sum_{r=1}^3 i\lambda_r = -Z_1 < 4, \quad (34)$$

which means that inequalities (28) are also assured.

We end with the obvious observation that $V_{eff}^{1,f}$ contains no absorptive part. It follows that for field configurations to which our result applies, no spontaneous fermion pair creation occurs. Convergence conditions formulated above can be regarded as sufficient conditions to forbid this phenomenon, to order $\hbar$. In particular, one comes to the non-trivial conclusion that fermion pair creation does not necessarily take place for pure electric fields, in contrast to the well known case of quantum electrodynamics. Absence of the absorptive part in our result is, in fact, not surprising: one knows that particle creation in time independent fields is essentially a non-perturbative effect [5]. In our calculation, this quality was clearly lost (in a strict sense, at least) with the Taylor expansion of the cos factors in eq. (7).

Acknowledgments

I thank to Atilla Farkas for reading the manuscript.

References

- [1] J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **82**, (1951) 664.
- [2] F. A. Berezin, *The Method of Second Quantization*, (Academic, New York) 1966.
- [3] C. Itzykson and J. B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, (Mc-Graw Hill, New York) 1980, p. 193.
- [4] I. S. Gradshteyn and J. M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, (Academic, New York) 1980.
- [5] A. A. Grib, S. G. Mamaev, V. M. Mostepanenko, *Quantum Effects in Strong External Fields. Non-perturbative methods and results.* (Moscow: Atomizdat); in Russian.